UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,441	10/31/2003	Takanobu Adachi	SHO-0022	7736

23353 7590 07/16/2007
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
BANTA, TRAVIS R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/697,441	ADACHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Travis R. Banta	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 April 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

An amendment was filed on April 11, 2007. Claims 1,2,3, and 5 were amended. Claims 7-12 have been added. Claims 1-12 are pending

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites the term "moving velocity". The Examiner has made a good faith effort to discover the meaning of this term. From the Applicant's arguments, the specification and abstract, the Examiner has not been able to extrapolate a meaning beyond the understanding the Examiner used in the first action. The Examiner understands a first and second display to be involved. The Examiner understands further that the moving velocity of game information differs between a first and second display when information moves between the first display area and the second display area. Within that meaning, the first area of Loose et al. is the rotating wheels. The second area is the transmissive video display. The reels are well known in the art to spin faster than humans are able to process the information. Videos are well known in the art to provide information at some speed slower than humans are able to process information. Game players are not able to interpret meaning from spinning wheels, but they are able to interpret meaning from video. Thus, when game information is displayed such as payout values, a pay table, pay lines,

bonus game features, special effects, thematic scenery, and instructional information on the video screen, moving information from the reels to the video screen, the moving velocity of the game information is different. Using this interpretation, the terms "display mode" and "moving velocity" are interchangeable. The claims will be examined as such.

Appropriate correction or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-10, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Loose et al US(6,517,433).

Regarding claim 1, Loose et al ('433) discloses a gaming machine with a display (see column 2 lines 27-35). The machine has a means to generate a bonus round and a predetermined win that is displayed on the display (see column 3:11-14 and 48-50). The display is comprised of rotating slot wheels and an LCD screen that is disposed on the front side of the gaming machine (see figure 1). The displays both have associated display areas (see column 3 line 41-44). Game information is displayed on the rotating

slot wheels and on the LCD screen so it is able to move between displays (see column 2 lines 27-35).

Regarding claim 2, Loose et al ('433) discloses that the rotating slot wheels are viewable through a transmissive LCD screen so that the rotating slot wheels are included in the means for the second display (see column 3 lines 41-44).

Regarding claim 3 and 12, Loose et al ('433) discloses that game information in a to have a moving velocity for a first display and a second display. It is inherent that the game information on the slot wheels have a greater velocity than that of the information on the LCD as applied in the indefiniteness rejection above (see column 3 lines 41-44 and column 2 lines 27-35).

Regarding claim 4, Loose et al ('433) discloses the first display to be an area where the game result is displayed (see column 3 lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 5, Loose et al ('433) discloses an almost instantaneous stop display time when the rotating slot wheels stop spinning. The LCD continues to accentuate the result of the game and therefore has a longer stop display time than the rotating slot wheels (see column 4 lines 3-11).

Regarding claim 6, Loose et al ('433) discloses that the display mode is changeable by human interaction (see column 5 lines 24-30).

Regarding claim 7, Loose et al ('443) discloses the transmittance of the first display area changes simultaneously with a time that the game information is displayed in a predetermined mode (see column 4 lines 61-64 and column 5 lines 24-42).

Regarding claim 8, Loose et al. ('443) discloses a window display area displayed on the second display area is variably displayed so as to enclose the first display area when information moves within the first display area (see column 5 lines 31-42).

Regarding claim 10, Loose et al. ('443) discloses an illumination device wherein an illumination mode of the device continuously changes corresponding to the moving velocity of game information (see column 4 lines 6-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loose et al. as applied above.

Loose et al ('443) discloses audio/video resources to be played in connection with the game (see column 6 lines 4-12. It is well known in the art that audio/video can be used to intensify the gaming experience. Thus audio/video is typically played based on the wager, game theme, speed of the game, and others. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that playing audio/video relative to the speed of the game is an excellent way of creating excitement in the game. It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the audio video of the game corresponding to the moving velocity of the game to create or maintain player excitement in the game.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant has argued that Loose et al. ('443) does not teach that a moving velocity of game information concerning with the game differs in a case that the game information is displayed on the first display area and in a case that the game information is displayed on the second display area when the game information is displayed so as to move between the first display area and the second display area.

As outlined above in the indefiniteness rejection, the Examiner could not construe a meaning for moving velocity in the context of claims 1-11. As such, the Examiner made his best guess for understanding as outlined above. The Examiner believes this to be a fair interpretation of the reference and the claims. Thus, the rejection is respectfully maintained for claims 1-6.

Claim 12 is determined to be the same as the combination of claims 1 and 3 in context of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. The Applicant has not argued for this claim as it is a new rejection to a new claim. However, the Examiner has rejected it for the same reasons claim 3 was rejected before as they are deemed to be equivalent.

If the Examiner can be of further service, the Applicant is invited to contact the Examiner.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Travis R. Banta whose telephone number is (571) 272-1615. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bob Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TB

Ronald Laneau

RONALD LANEAU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/6/07